

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/767,422	01/19/2001	Jonathan E. Schroeder	030633.0010	9547

36183 7590 08/06/2004

PAUL, HASTINGS, JANOFSKY & WALKER LLP
P.O. BOX 919092
SAN DIEGO, CA 92191-9092

EXAMINER

TRAN, QUOC A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/767,422

Applicant(s)

SCHROEDER ET AL.

Examiner

Quoc A. Tran

Art Unit

2176

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 01/27/2003.
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____.
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to application filed 01/19/2001.
2. Claims 1-30 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 10, 11 and 26 are independent claims.
3. If a copy of a provisional application listed on the bottom portion of the accompanying Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) form is not included with this Office action and the PTO-892 has been annotated to indicate that the copy was not readily available, it is because the copy could not be readily obtained when the Office action was mailed. Should applicant desire a copy of such a provisional application, applicant should promptly request the copy from the Office of Public Records (OPR) in accordance with 37 CFR 1.14(a)(1)(iv), paying the required fee under 37 CFR 1.19(b)(1). If a copy is ordered from OPR, the shortened statutory period for reply to this Office action will not be reset under MPEP § 710.06 unless applicant can demonstrate a substantial delay by the Office in fulfilling the order for the copy of the provisional application. Where the applicant has been notified on the PTO-892 that a copy of the provisional application is not readily available, the provision of MPEP § 707.05(a) that a copy of the cited reference will be automatically furnished without charge does not apply.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. **Claims 1-2, 4-9, 11-13, and 21-29, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al. US Pub No. 2002/0161688 A1 issued 10/31/2002 filed 02/16/2001 provisional Application No. 60/183,067 filed 02/16/2000 (hereinafter '688).**

In regard to independent claim 26, *" A method of conducting electronic commerce by translating a data files between a first file format associated with a first trading partner and an XML file format associated with a second trading partner, the method comprising: receiving the data file; determining a file format of the data file; accessing a data definition file associated with the file format; comparing each segment of the data definition file to each segment of the data file; and generating an XML element in response to each match determined between the compared segments", as taught by '688 at page 8, paragraphs [0100]-[0109] (i.e. The central c-hub components (transport 174, scheduler 178, and router 182). ... The decoder 176, encoder 186,*

conversation manager 190, and repository 192 components may be made available for customers to change or access... The router 180 and filter 184 components are customizable by the customer.... The incoming message is read and routed to an appropriate decoder chain based on the message protocol... Any protocol-specific headers in the message are processed by the decoder and the appropriate business protocol handler is assigned...), and also as taught by '688 at page 8, paragraphs [0126]-[0127] (i.e.... c-space, the invention provides asynchronous XML messaging capabilities to allow loosely coupled communication between trading partners 216, 218. This model leverages routing and filter functionality that can be associated with messages in order to classify the set of trading partners that should receive a message, allowing partners and their interactions to be managed individually, based on their role or trading preferences within an e-market... The c-hub is the execution engine of a c-space, allowing the c-space owner and trading partners to create, route, and manage messages within the trading environment. To facilitate the execution of business transactions across a disparate base of trading partners, one embodiment of the invention uses XML as its e-business messaging semantic. FIG. 5 shows some XML transfer paths between trading partners (using c-enablers), and a trading hub hosting a c-space).

In regard to dependent claim 27, *“wherein the data definition file is generated in response to an implementation guide received from the first trading partner”,* as taught by '688 at page 7, paragraphs [0085] (i.e. ...company must first decides on the business purpose of the c-space (c-space is an abstraction supporting a single business

model, business message protocols, a secure message space, security policies, quality of service policies, and a registered set of business trading partners. The c-space contains message vocabularies, business process models, participant roles, and other e-market metadata that are essential to the creation, deployment, and ongoing maintenance of trading activities), define a vocabulary, and a set of protocols, and provide a specification...).

In regard to dependent claim 28, “*wherein the data definition file is an XML file*”, as taught by ‘688 at page 7, paragraphs [0085] (i.e..... The messages can be in any format--the invention is designed to be flexible in the type of messaging the c-hub understands. For standardization purposes and to ensure the widest usage of the invention, in one embodiment industry standard XML messages can be used...).

In regard to dependent claim 29, “*determining a location of the segment of the data file in response information included in the data definition file*”, as taught by ‘688 at page 7, paragraphs [0085] (i.e..... Trading partners use collaboration enablers, or c-enablers 158, software applications allowing them to send messages to, and receive messages from, the c-hub. The enablers may also interface with workflow processes and servers at the trading partners' location so that such messages are generated and received automatically...).

In regard to independent claim 1, is incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 26 above, and in further view of the following, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale,

"the first data file having a first file format and being an electronic representation of at least one document", as taught by '688 at page 1, paragraphs [0007] (i.e. The present invention relates generally to the transaction of business-to-business commerce using the Web),

" translating the received first data file into at least one second data file having an XML file format, wherein the received first data file is translated using at least one data definition file associated with the at least one document, the at least one data definition file being used to translate the first data file into the at least one second data file; and transforming the at least one second data file into a normalized third data file having an XML file format, wherein the third data file is normalized according to a data format associated with the second trading partner ", as taught by '688 at page 7, paragraphs [0085] (i.e. ...company must first decides on the business purpose of the c-space (c-space is an abstraction supporting a single business model, business message protocols, a secure message space, security policies, quality of service policies, and a registered set of business trading partners. The c-space contains message vocabularies, business process models, participant roles, and other e-market metadata that are essential to the creation, deployment, and ongoing maintenance of trading activities), define a vocabulary, and a set of protocols, and provide a specification. FIG. 5 shows the installation of the c-space into the collaboration system. The central collaboration provider installs a collaboration hub, or c-hub 154, most likely at their place of business but the c-hub can be installed anywhere geographically; such is the benefit of a global e-commerce solution. The c-hub controls a collaboration space, or c-

Art Unit: 2176

space 156--an abstract structure wherein collaboration messages are transmitted back and forth between trading partners in a continuous conversation-like manner. Trading partners use collaboration enablers, or c-enablers 158, software applications allowing them to send messages to, and receive messages from, the c-hub. The enablers may also interface with workflow processes and servers at the trading partners' location so that such messages are generated and received automatically. The messages can be in any format--the invention is designed to be flexible in the type of messaging the c-hub understands. For standardization purposes and to ensure the widest usage of the invention, in one embodiment industry standard XML messages can be used. The enabler may then send and receive such XML messages to and from the c-hub by any convenient means, including the Internet...).

In regard to dependent claim 2, *“further comprising translating the normalized third data file format an XML file format into a file format requested by the second trading partner”*, as taught by '688 at page 7, paragraphs [0085] (i.e.... business trading partners. ... The messages can be in any format-- the invention is designed to be flexible in the type of messaging the c-hub understands. For standardization purposes and to ensure the widest usage of the invention, in one embodiment industry standard XML messages can be used... The enabler may then send and receive such XML messages to and from the c-hub by any convenient means, including the Internet...).

In regard to dependent claim 4, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 26 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 5, *“displaying the normalized third data file using a web browser in human-readable format”*, as taught by ‘688 at page 13, paragraphs [0234] (i.e.... allows the c-space owner or designated administrator to configure and manage services and c-spaces using a Web browser...).

In regard to dependent claim 6, *“The method of Claim 5, and further comprising receiving modifications to the displayed third normalized data file, such modifications being made by altering data in fields of the normalized third data file using a browser form”*, as taught by ‘688 at page 13, paragraphs [0234] (i.e.... manage services and c-spaces using a Web browser. Common administrative functions include managing trading partners (adding or removing trading partners, granting and revoking access to conversations, etc.), configuring messaging services, monitoring on-going conversations, browsing system status (interactions, message delivery, and logs), and generating activity reports...).

In regard to dependent claim 7, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 27 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 8, *“communicating a data file corresponding to one or more portions of the normalized third data file to an order fulfillment application of the second trading partner”*, as taught by ‘688 at page 18, paragraph [0327] (i.e.... The workflow model is de-centralized, so each transactor executes it's own instance of the engine. The implementation manages multiple contexts simultaneously, so a transactor can be involved in many (but separate) business transactions at the same time. XML is also used for storing the state of a workflow context. This allows this embodiment to re-

load the state of a context in a different system. This design has some interesting consequences, for example the system should scale nicely in the WLS cluster environment).

In regard to dependent claim 9, *“translating the normalized third data file into a fourth data file having a file format desired by the second trading partner; and communicating the fourth data file to the second trading partner in the desired file format”*, as taught by ‘688 at page 7, paragraphs [0085] (i.e. ... define a vocabulary, and a set of protocols, and provide a specification. FIG. 5 shows the installation of the c-space into the collaboration system. The central collaboration provider installs a collaboration hub, or c-hub 154, most likely at their place of business but the c-hub can be installed anywhere geographically; such is the benefit of a global e-commerce solution. The c-hub controls a collaboration space, or c-space 156--an abstract structure wherein collaboration messages are transmitted back and forth between trading partners in a continuous conversation-like manner. Trading partners use collaboration enablers, or c-enablers 158, software applications allowing them to send messages to, and receive messages from, the c-hub. The enablers may also interface with workflow processes and servers at the trading partners' location so that such messages are generated and received automatically. The messages can be in any format--the invention is designed to be flexible in the type of messaging the c-hub understands. For standardization purposes and to ensure the widest usage of the invention, in one embodiment industry standard XML messages can be used. The

enabler may then send and receive such XML messages to and from the c-hub by any convenient means, including the Internet...).

In regard to independent claim 11, is directed to a system for performing the method of claims 1-2, 26, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 12, is directed to a system for performing the method of claims 1-2, 26, and in further view of the following, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

“communicate the normalized third data file to a mailbox associated with the second trading partner”, as taught by '688 at page 15, paragraph [0261] (i.e. ... FIG. 24 illustrates a c-proxy. C-proxies 438 may be used to send and receive messages from a c-space 440 to a remote client 442, such as an email system, XSL display device, or a wireless (WAP) device...).

In regard to dependent claim 13, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 26, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 21, *“a communications mailbox, the communications mailbox operable to generate a message to the first trading partner or the second trading partner in response to a predetermined event”*, as taught by '688 at page 15, paragraph [0261] (i.e. ... FIG. 24 illustrates a c-proxy. C-proxies 438 may be used to send and receive messages from a c-space 440 to a remote client 442, such as an email system, XSL display device, or a wireless (WAP) device...).

In regard to dependent claim 22, *“The system of Claim 21, wherein the predetermined event is a rejection of a document associated with the third normalized*

data file", as taught by '688 at page 17, paragraph [0304] (i.e. ... from the Preamble and Service Header. This will be parsed with a validating XML parser. An error here will be logged and returned to the sender as a rejected message...).

In regard to dependent claim 23, *"The system of Claim 21, wherein the predetermined event is an exception condition"*, as taught by '688 at page 17, paragraph [0297] (i.e. ... If a particular business protocol is passing messages that have a digital signature, then the operations that a Logic Plug-In can perform on those message will generally be restricted to read-only unless the Logic Plug-In is allowed to re-sign messages on behalf of the original sender (or has access to the original sender's certificate/private key) ...).

In regard to dependent claim 24, *"The system of Claim 21, wherein the message is customized to the third normalized file"*, as taught by '688 at page 18, paragraphs [0327]-[0332] (i.e....message types...).

In regard to dependent claim 25, *"The system of Claim 21, wherein the message is customized to the third normalized file"*, as taught by '688 at page 17, paragraphs [0299] (i.e.... passes all the way through the c-hub to the recipient, who returns the HTTP status code. The transport layer then returns that status to the layer initiating the outbound request, which passes it back through the various c-hub layers and eventually to the sender...).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 10, 14-20, and 30, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stewart et al. US Pub No. 2002/0161688 A1 issued 10/31/2002 filed 02/16/2001 provisional Application No. 60/183,067 filed 02/16/2000 (hereinafter '688), in view of Aegerter US Pub No. 2002/0069192 A1 issued 06/06/2002 filed 12/04/2001 provisional Application No. 60/251,285 filed 12/04/2000 (hereinafter '192).

Claim 30 is representing of claim 10;

In regard to dependent claim 30, '688 does not explicitly teach, "*generating an XML element further comprises generating an element tag and associated element data from information included in the matched segment of the data file*", however '192 taught at page 1, paragraph [0011] (i. e.... XML (Extensible Markup Language) is a known document processing standard (a simplified form of SGML). It allows a developer to create a custom vocabulary or "schema" defining a custom markup language. This can be done using a document type definition (DTD) or with the XML Schema Definition

(XSD), among other schema languages. The schema specifies what elements or tags and attributes can be used in a document and how they relate to each other ...).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of '688 that include modular programming for generating their own tags for a document according to a particular XML data model. One of ordinary skill would be motivated to perform such a modification to enable users to easily define a data model, which may change/modify, and most of all bring together the industry standards in a unique way of web document content (i.e. electronic data files) from one document to another (i.e. between trading partners), as taught by '192 at page 2, paragraph [0035] (i.e..... brings together and extends industry standards in a unique way to create...).

In regard to independent claim 10, is incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 1 and 30 above, and in further view of the following, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale,

“receiving an implementation guide associated with the first file format, the implementation guide defining the fields of the first data file”, as taught by '192 at page 8, paragraphs [0151] (i.e. ... of labels to generate user interface objects based on the language context without need for explicit reference to labels via XPath. For example, the < > element in the sample syntax provided in Appendix A specifies a labeled editable field...).

In regard to dependent claim 3, '688 does not explicitly teach, *“accessing an XSLT associated with one of the at least one second data files, the XSLT being used to*

Art Unit: 2176

transform the one of the at least one second data files into the normalized third data file", however '192 taught at page 2, paragraph [0015] (i. e. XSLT, or Extensible Stylesheet Language-Transformation, is a useful tool for working with XML documents. XSLT enables one to extract and transform the source information in various ways, for example into another markup language like HTML as is commonly done...).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of '688 that include XSLT, or Extensible Stylesheet Language-Transformation modular programming for transforming data files into a unique industry standards (i.e. normalized) for communicating among trading partners. One of ordinary skill would be motivated to perform such a modification to enable users to easily define a data model, which may change/modify, and most of all bring together the industry standards in a unique way of web document content (i.e. data files) from one document to another (i.e. between trading partners), as taught by '192 at page 2, paragraph [0035] (i.e..... brings together and extends industry standards in a unique way to create...).

In regard to dependent claim 14, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 30, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 15, is directed to a system for performing the method of claim 3, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 16-18, are directed to a system for performing the method of claims 3, 30, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 19, *“standard rules include error-checking rules and compliance rules”*, as taught by ‘688 at page 17, paragraphs [0301] (i.e. ... message persistence capabilities of the c-hub ...encounters errors at the business rule level (message content), a separate out-of-band error reporting mechanism ... this can be routed through the c-hub ...).

In regard to dependent claim 20, *“validation and transformational rules”*, as taught by ‘688 at page 17, paragraph [0295] (i.e. ... Since the c-hub is acting as a trusted intermediary, this will validate that the sender is who is claimed before the message is passed on to the recipient. If the match fails, the message will be rejected by the c-hub), and further taught by ‘688 at page 17, paragraphs [0304] (i.e. ... the Preamble and Service Header. This will be parsed with a validating XML parse ...).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Wanderski et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,519,617 B1 issued 02/11/2003 filed 04/08/1999

Meltzer et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,125,391 B1 issued 09/26/2000 filed 10/16/1998

Mary Fernandez et al. “SilkRoute: trading between relations and XML” Publisher
AT&T Lab Research, Florham Park, NY and University of Pennsylvania, USA

Published 06/2000 volume 33, issues 1-6 Web URL www.elsevier.com/locate/commet


8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

Art Unit: 2176

examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (703) 305-8781. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H. Feild can be reached on (703) 305-9792. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Quoc A. Tran

Patent Examiner

Technology Center 2176

July 23, 2004